



TELEPHONE AROWICK 2681

26 NOV/1952

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER,

FACULTY OF LAW,

DOVER STREET,  
248, OXFORD ROAD,

MANCHESTER, 13.

WMC/RB

The Hon. Mrs Franklin, C.B.E.  
50, Porchester Terrace,  
London, W. 2.

24th November, 1952.

Dear Mrs Franklin,

I was glad to get your letter. I had been thinking about the problem and I feel that we are faced with the biggest policy decision our Committee has yet faced. I feel most strongly that on matters of principle you should stand firm ... but on all other matters one should meet the Ministry ready to admit their reasonable demands. And - though I am not learned on these matters - it did not seem to me that we should win any public support at all if we fought the Ministry on the question of our allowing certain members of staff to submit themselves to the experience of teaching. But I wouldn't really wish to press such a view. I am probably biased. All my best ideas come to me as a consequence of teaching!!

It did strike me, however, that we should weaken the standing of the P. N. E. U. ideas in every school in the country if we withdrew them from the Practising School ... the school in which the next generation's practitioners of these ideas are trained. I cannot help but feel that if we truckled to the Ministry in that matter without a contest our action would be quoted against us in every other school and our position would be considerably weakened.

I should like to talk over this matter with you both - very much indeed - not that I'm likely to be able to advise - but chiefly to clear up my own mind. And I've written at length because I don't think I shall be in London for some time yet. I will let you know when I do come up. In the meantime the Ministry - I speak from some experience here - is a reasonable body and will not involve itself in a public fight if we too are reasonable and choose the issues rightly.

Yours sincerely,

*Franklin*

15/Jan/60

3rd December 1952

Dear Professor Cooper,

Many thanks for your letter, may I first ask your help in a matter of dates. Miss Brown, secretary to the Charlotte Mason Foundation, has with difficulty found a date for our next meeting (March 11th) to suit you; Miss Popham and the notices have all gone out to this effect. Now Miss Van Straubenzee remembers that the inspectors from your department have fixed March as the month for visiting Ambleside, could you ask them to avoid 9th to 13th.

As regards the other matter about which I wrote, if you come to London do please let me know, and if not before March 11th then could you perhaps get here by 12.30 and talk over lunch. Meanwhile may I just point out that 3 out of the 4 members of the P.U.S. staff have had about 20 years teaching experience with all ages of children, and Miss Molyneux herself with adults too in the A.T.S. She has taught in families using P.U.S. and has had a senior school of her own. Miss Simon has taught till last year in families and her last post 5 years in a school, Miss Williamson ditto. They are anything but women framing programmes in a study away from any contact with children.

The letters of advice and help to those using these programmes show their interest in and understanding of children. In fact I venture to think their experience with children of all ages would equal, if not surpass that of the inspectors

15p2pneu6c

themselves who have usually been specialists in one or other direction.

On the face of it it looks a simple matter that the members of the P.U.S. should take some of the teaching periods in Practising School, but quite apart from the difficulty of time tables, holidays etc there is an underlying principle involved. Such an arrangement would place them under two authorities, subject them to possible tiresome criticism even as you will see to the question of appointment and dismissal.

I believe that harmony and a quiet atmosphere will be best achieved if the Principal of the College and the Director of the P.U.S. are allowed each to carry out their important work independently. I may add that the Ministry has always had the most friendly and appreciative relations with Miss Molyneux.

I apologize for this very long letter. With thanks for all your help.

Yours sincerely,

160 new 160

BMS/KB

25th. July, 1960.

V.W.G. Ranger, Esq.,  
Messrs. Ranger, Burton & Frost,  
Stafford House,  
Norfolk Street,  
Strand, W.C.2.

Dear Mr. Ranger,

I was most grateful for the meeting at your office this morning and I am happy about the progress achieved.

I enclose a copy of the letter I have sent to Mrs. Walton in which I have tried to predict, very roughly, the time table for the steps towards merging the P.M.E.U. and Charlotte Mason Foundation.

With reference to enclosure 'G' to your letter of the 18th. July, 1960, paragraph 3, I enclose forms of membership for the P.M.E.U. and Associate Membership. At present Associate Membership does not entitle the Associate Members to membership of the Company and, therefore, I rather feel it should be disregarded altogether for the purposes of the merger. Associate Membership was a recent expedient to try to make parents of children at P.M.E.U. Schools contribute towards the movement. These forms are sent to P.M.E.U. Schools, some of whom manage to recruit many parents and others do not seem to have done much about it. Associate Members are usually invited to the Annual General Meeting through the Schools who apply for invitation cards. If, however, an item had to be put to the vote, I do not think they would be entitled to vote.

Yours sincerely,

(Basil Marsden-Smedley)

i7plpneu160

PARENTS' NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL UNION

as from: 34, Tedworth Squire,  
Chelsea, S.W.3.

BMS/EB

25th. July, 1960.

Mrs. G.C. Walton,  
Galleons,  
Higher Lane,  
Mumbles,  
Swansea, Glam.

Dear Mrs. Walton,

I am afraid there is very little likelihood of the necessary steps leading to the completion of the merger, enabling us to hold the final Extraordinary General Meetings of the P.N.E.U. and the Charlotte Mason Foundation on 19th. October, when the P.N.E.U. hold their Annual General Meeting. This cannot be helped, but it is rather a blow as we had hoped to save the cost of postage by combining the notices of the two General Meetings. However, the P.N.E.U. will have to face a second postage to it's 3,000 members; there is no such difficulty in the case of the Foundation.

In these circumstances, I thought I would rough out a time table, but estimating, in each case on the pessimistic side. I hope in the event the time may be considerably shortened.

This is the time table:

July. 12th. 1960.

Begin preparing draft documents. This operation cannot be completed before August Bank Holiday; and for five or six weeks the Merger Sub-Committee would be unlikely to collect a quorum.

About September 12th. to 19th.

Meeting of Merger Sub-Committee and Mr. Ranger to approve draft documents and fix the date for meetings of the P.N.E.U. Executive Committee and the Council of the Foundation.

P.R.O.

17ppnem160

- 2 -

Before the Committee and Council meet, time must be allowed for printing draft documents in proof form for approval by the Board of Trade and the Ministry of Education, as well as by the Committee and the Council.

About October 25th. to 29th.

Consecutive meetings of the P.B.E.U. Executive Committee and the Council of the Foundation, in accordance with the recommendations contained in Mr. Ranger's letter to you of July 11th., 1960. These meetings will have before them the printed proofs referred to above. It is very much to be hoped that they will confirm the recommendations of their joint Sub-Committee, without, or with no more than nominal revisions. The documents, if approved, will then have to be printed and the notices dispatched (say two weeks) so as to reach members at least twenty-three days before the Extraordinary General Meetings.

About December 5th. to 10th.

Consecutive Extraordinary General Meetings to be held at the same time and place, in accordance with the advice of Mr. Ranger, contained in his letter referred to above. Mr. Ranger tells me it will be advisable to have a meeting of the Council immediately after the Extraordinary General Meeting.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the members of the Merger Sub-Committee, the Hon. Treasurers of the two organisations and to Mr. Ranger.

Yours sincerely,

Sg. Basil Marsden-Smedley.

180/pneu160

COPY

EDEN HEY,  
Stanwix,  
Carlisle.

3rd. August, 1960.

Dear Marsden-Smedley,

Thank you for sending the copy of your letter to Mrs. Walton of 25th. July, which I am sorry not to have been able to acknowledge before now.

I have been giving thought, since the C.M.F. Meeting in Ambleside of 9th. July, to the question of the proposed P.N.E.U.-C.M.F. Merger and feel it would be useful to let Mrs. Walton and you have my thoughts on paper, which can be summarised as follows:-

- 1) Ever since you described the position as you saw it, first at the C.M.F. Meetings and subsequently to the merger sub-committee, the merger appeared in theory the logical outcome of the way in which affairs connected with Charlotte Mason have developed and it seemed sensible to press ahead with it.
- 2) On the other hand, I have been worried that ever since the decision to proceed with legal enquiries about the merger was taken there has appeared a reluctance on the part of some important elements in the C.M.F. to accept the logic of the situation, which might well lead the C.M.F. to decide not to proceed with the merger when it actually came to the point of formal agreement.
- 3) This reluctance must, one feels, arise either because there is not in fact felt to be true identity of aims as between P.N.E.U. and C.M.F. respectively, or because of a feared clash of personalities, or both. One example that immediately comes to mind is the fact that whereas at our sub-committee there seemed to be immediate and complete unanimity as to the fact that the name "P.N.E.U." was the important one to preserve from the point of view of public propaganda etc. (Provided the name of "Charlotte Mason" was associated with it whenever feasible) I now find that there is a strong and important body of opinion which feels that the name "Charlotte Mason" is the more well-known and respected among educational circles and which therefore feels that this must have "priority".
- 4) It would obviously be unwise to proceed with the merger as envisaged until we were sure there was a reasonable identity of view on both sides, and it would also be foolish on the part of the C.M.F. to proceed with it when, so far as I can see, they hold the stronger cards, if they feel there is any danger of some of the things they consider important suffering as a result of the merger.

OVER

- 2 -

5) Two possible solutions to the problem just outlined seem available:-

(a) to make the terms of the merger such that the C.M.F., in taking into partnership what appears to be the financially weaker member, will have the controlling voice in that partnership, or

(b) to thrash out in detail before the merger:-

- (i) what are to be the aims and priorities of the new organisation.
- (ii) who are to be its first officers.
- (iii) the details of the future organisation of work, staff, location of offices and headquarters, etc.  
- matters which our joint committee suggested would be due to be worked out at a later stage after the merger had been formally agreed and completed.

6) If neither of these alternatives are acceptable, or if time does not permit because of the need for a quick solution of P.N.E.U's present financial problems, then, as I suggested to you at Ambleside, we should perhaps look into the possibility of C.M.F. making a subvention payment to P.N.E.U. until such time as conditions are more propitious for a merger.

7) It is perhaps a pity that there has not been really adequate time at either of the last two C.M.F. Council Meetings to have all the views on the problem involved in the merger aired adequately, and that therefore some of these have only emerged in discussion between individuals after the Meetings. But the most urgent matter from the C.M.F. point of view over these last months has obviously been the negotiations regarding the College and the discussions on these would appear to have needed to take priority.

If what I have written above does at all reflect the present position - and I have written it fully conscious of my being a relative newcomer and "outsider" in regard to all these problems - then it is perhaps just as well that the "timetable" could not in any case have moved much faster than as outlined in your letter to Mrs. Walton of July 25th., as I am sure there must be time to make certain that as far as humanly possible unanimity is reached between all those concerned

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mrs. Walton.

Yours sincerely,

Sgd. JOCELYN MORTON.

19p1phsu160

As from: 34, Tedworth Square,  
London, S.W.3.

MMS/EB

4th. August, 1960.

J. Norton, Esq.,  
Eden Hey,  
Stamwix,  
Carlisle.

My dear Jocelyn,

Thank you for your letter of the 3rd. August, about the P.N.E.U. and Charlotte Mason Foundation.

It is, as you infer, deplorable that when things have gone so far that people should start going back on decisions. I am very grateful, however, for your letter, as that sets out the facts and arguments voiced by what I am sure should be considered an irresponsible minority and which can be very easily disposed of I hope, if you and I were to meet. Although it is very important to discuss all matters which, rightly or wrongly, give rise to dissensions, I feel strong exception should be taken in the best interests of the P.N.E.U. and Charlotte Mason Foundation to most of the points referred to in paragraphs 2 - 6 of your letter. I can deal with them separately, by rather a long letter; but if you are in London, surely it would be better for us to meet?

I would emphasise that I am sure those of us who feel that the proposals envisaged by the Merger Sub-Committee were most urgently needed, would feel it would be only right to meet any point of substance; but I must point out that there has been an immense amount of detailed preparations to implement the policy decisions of the Merger Sub-Committee - decisions, I would add, which have been confirmed and agreed on at several meetings of both organisations, over a period of half a year. This detailed preparation is now far advanced. I know Mrs. Walton said in her letter to me she was writing to you; but I think it only right on receipt of the new lines of thought, to voice at once what must be the opinion of all the responsible members of both organisations, that it is a bit late in the day to make fundamental changes.

i9p2pneutbo

- 2 -

I am going to stay with Mrs. Franklin in Ireland between August 18th. and the beginning of September. If you happen to be in London before August 18th. or early in September, it would be very happy in every way and most useful if we could meet - perhaps at my house again.

By the time I leave for Ireland I hope that Mr. Ranger will have the numerous draft documents ready for dispatch to the members of the Merger Sub-Committee. Alternatively, if it would suit you better, it would be equally pleasant for me and useful, if I could perhaps call in on you at Carlisle on my way back from Ireland. I have not yet arranged whether I fly or come by boat from Belfast, but if it were more convenient I imagine that there would be little deviation in reaching you at Carlisle.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mrs. Walton and also to Mrs. Franklin who, as you know, was the first-named Trustee under the Will of Charlotte Mason and must obviously have her say in all fundamental issues of policy.

Yours sincerely,  
ever,

Sgd. Basil.

(Basil Mareden-Smedley)

*(SOPHIA 160)*

COPY

EDEN HEY,  
STANWIX,  
CARLISLE.

8th. August, 1960.

My dear Basil,

Many thanks for your letter of the 4th. I think, in view of your reaction to mine of the 3rd., I ought to try to put the matter into perspective as I see it.

The present suggestion for a merger arose immediately from:-

- (a) the decision to let the Local Education Authority become responsible for running the College, and the somewhat altered function of the C.M.F. Council, coincident with:-
- (b) the financial stringency of P.N.E.U. affairs.

Under these circumstances it seemed to the merger sub-committee (and certainly to me individually as a member of that Committee, at that time a relative newcomer to C.M.F. affairs in general) a sensible and logical suggestion in principle that the two organisations should be merged, and it was decided to recommend to the latter accordingly.

The C.M.F. Council at the meeting in March, although it had a fairly long discussion on the sub-committee report, did not have time to discuss it in as complete detail as may perhaps have been called for, but did accept the recommendation in principle that the merger was desirable. At the same time, it was made clear that no merger could take place at least until after the College negotiations were signed and sealed.

It was agreed that the legal implications should meanwhile be gone into (the same lawyer for both sides being used to reduce legal costs) with a view to legal documents being put forward for both sides to consider in due course. I say "consider" as I never envisaged, and I am sure others at the C.M.F. Council Meeting in March did not envisage, that the lawyer was merely to be instructed to carry out the merger, with the controlling bodies of the respective organisations being expected to "rubber-stamp" the documents thus produced without any further discussions of detail.

OVER

- 2 -

Such detail might be considered to be relatively unimportant in view of this agreement in principle that the merger was desirable if we were sure there was complete identity of view between the two sides that it is proposed to merge, but it was the growing awareness that such identity may not be complete that made me feel I should write to you and Mrs. Walton as I did, as I am quite sure it would be fatal for both organisations, and through that for the aims they both hold important, to merge into one organisation in which there was any conflict "built-in" from the start. Indeed, however sensible and logical I might feel the merger was in principle, I would feel reluctant to press my colleagues on the Council to accept the merger until we were reasonably satisfied there was this identity of view - that seems to me the all important thing.

I view of this, however much I would welcome a talk with you personally at this stage about the present position, I would have thought it was more important, if she feels the same as I do, for Mrs. Walton to have some further discussion with you - not only because she is C.M.F. Chairman, but because she inevitably knows the whole background of the Foundation and the philosophy behind it so much more than I do, who am very much an outsider and a new boy, and who find it difficult therefore to assess the "imponderables", which may be equally important as the considerations which appear logical and "business-like".

I will let her, of course, have a copy of this letter (and I see she already has a copy of yours to me) so that she can take action as she feels desirable at this stage.

Yours,

Sgd. JOCELYN.

B. Marsden-Smedley, Esq.,  
34, Tedworth Square,  
Chelsea,  
London, S.W.3.

## PARENTS' NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL UNION.

FOUNDED 1888. INCORPORATED 1921.

Founder—Charlotte M. Mason      Presidents—The Lord and The Lady Brabourne  
 Chairman of Executive—Basil Marsden-Smedley, O.B.E.  
 Hon. Treasurer—R. K. Nuttall

Hon. Secretary—The Hon. Mrs. FRANKLIN, O.B.E.  
 Gen. Sec.—Mrs. McEWAN HAYLES

OFFICE OPEN—10—4, except Saturdays.

MURRAY HOUSE, VANDON STREET,  
LONDON, S.W.1.

(Near St. James's Park Underground Station)

As from: 34, Tedworth Square, Chelsea, S.W.3,  
 9th. August, 1960.

BMS/EB

The Hon. Mrs. Franklin, C.B.E.,  
 Glenalla,  
 Ray,  
 Letterkenny,  
 Co. Donegal,  
 N. Ireland.

Dear Mrs. Franklin,

I am sorry to keep writing to you in Ireland and would not do so if I did not know that you like to hear P.N.E.U. news.

I enclose a copy of the letter I have had from Jocelyn Morton and one I have sent to Mr. Ranger. I have heard confidentially from Mr. Ranger that Mrs. Walton and Jocelyn Morton have made an appointment with him for tomorrow, without saying a word to me. I think it a little odd that Jocelyn Morton should write to me in response to a request of mine to have a talk with him and not mention either that he was going to be in London, or that he and Mrs. Walton were going to see Mr. Ranger, or any wish to have the incorrect arguments in his previous letter put right. It seems to me rather a conspiracy.

Of course, they may ask me to go with them, or ask to see me at some other time; indeed, it would seem incredible for them not to do so, having regard to:-

(a) the fact that they presented me with particularly carefully drafted arguments and,

(b) my request to be allowed to deal with them at a meeting in London.

I do hope that you are having better weather than we are.

OVER

Appm 16a

- 2 -

We had a terrible storm on Sunday and I spent Sunday afternoon paddling in the basement of Crosby Hall, Chelsea (of which I am Chairman), which was flooded! We managed to move most of the perishable food.

Yours sincerely,

Basil Marsden-Smedley

(Basil Marsden-Smedley)

1/20/pneu/60

Copies to: ✓ Mrs. Franklin.  
Mr. Marsden-Smedley.  
Office File.

BMS/EB

CONFIDENTIAL As from: 34, Tedworth Square, Chelsea, SW3.  
9th. August, 1960.

V.W.G. Ranger, Esq.,  
Messrs. Ranger, Burton & Frost,  
Safford House,  
Norfolk Street,  
London, W.C.2.

Dear Mr. Ranger,

I enclose a copy of a letter that Jocelyn Morton has sent in reply to mine of August 4th., 1960, in which I asked to meet him if he could manage to see me in London, or if not I would call on him in Carlisle.

I do not think it is quite frank of him to have written in reply to this request another long explanation, without saying that he is going to be in London with Mrs. Walton and has an appointment to see you tomorrow. I surmise that he is being pushed by Mrs. Walton, who is entirely under the thumb of the Ambleside staff. As far as I know the only criticism of the Merger came from Miss Cholmondeley, at the meeting on July 12th, and from Miss Cholmondeley and a Mr. Jos, at the meeting in March. I do not regard this as giving the whole problem serious consideration in the light of the whole P.N.E.U. and Charlotte Mason movement.

The letter, itself, is an endeavour to try and make a minority of one or two people look like a substantial opposition.

In the meantime, because I hope to put the arguments in Jocelyn Morton's previous letter right at an interview, instead of by letter, he has not had his previous incorrect facts and arguments put right.

OVER

122p116b

- 2 -

The last paragraph is revealing in that it shows that he is leaving to her to say whether the two of them will see me, either at the interview with you or at some other time.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mrs. Franklin in Ireland.

Yours sincerely,

(Basil Marsden-Smedley)

ABP/MS/160

As from: 3<sup>rd</sup>, Tedworth Square,  
London, S.W.3.

BMS/160

12th. August, 1960.

Jocelyn Norton, Esq.,  
Eden Hey,  
Stanwick,  
Carlisle,

*My dear Jocelyn,*

I must say I was as surprised as anyone else would have been to hear that you and Mrs. Walton had been to London to discuss the merger without a word to me, in spite of the hope expressed in my letter of August, 4th, that we should deal with the numerous points you put to me in your letter to me of the 3rd. August, at a meeting rather than try and deal with them by letter. Could I have done more than offer to meet you in London or Carlisle?

This brings me to another point which I regard as fundamental to the great Charlotte Mason Movement, namely the difficulties that arise through trying to run the organisation satisfactorily on a London-Carlisle-South Wales basis. I know you are often in London and I can manage Ambleside from time to time; but the difficulties Mrs. Walton finds in tearing herself away from all her fascinating and wonderful activities in South Wales are immense. I longed for help in thinking out how to further the Movement; nevertheless some or most of the details have been framed as a result of discussions I have had with various people. I hope, therefore, that the reasons for your mission were not that you thought I was preparing to spring a fait accompli. The Merger sub-Committee will, I hope, co-operate in carrying the principles already agreed a stage further, but in any case will have complete freedom of action. I regard reasonably frequent availability for informal discussions as much more important, if I may say so, than dealing with all these matters in lengthy correspondence.

Contd.

- 2 -

In saying this I do not think anyone contemplates any strong or vast upheaval. The fact of 'hiving off' the Charlotte Mason College must create its own problems. Many of these will be policy decisions, which will have to be taken by Chairman's action between meetings, after informal consultations with a nucleus of interested members. Then there is the action of improvisation that springs from day-to-day consideration of problems and objectives. I do not have to say to you that in any business that means the difference between profit and loss; and in an educational charity, between success or failure.

You see how necessary consultation is and how disappointed I was that you rushed away to the back of beyond, without a word. I feel, however, in all politeness, I must give some very preliminary answers to some of the points you have raised with me in your letter of August, 3rd.

Paragraph 2 - The actual strength of "important elements" was Miss Cholmondeley and Mr. Jos at the March meeting; and Miss Cholmondeley at the July meeting.

Of course, there was a vociferous and, in my view, rather out of place sibilition from a number of the staff. I am not alone in thinking that in this case, while paying due regard to the views that have been expressed, to overestimate strength of the opposition. the L

Paragraph 3 - I am a little puzzled by the opening sentence of this paragraph as I cannot see how anyone can think there is not an identity of aims between the P.H.E.U. and the Charlotte Mason Foundation, knowing the life of Charlotte Mason, her Will, or the Articles of Association of the two organisations. Of course there are departmental differences of function within the two organisations; but a singleness of aim that would be better and more economically pursued as a result of the merger. I do not know where the suggestion that there might be a clash of personalities arose and if that is to be pursued as a serious

Contd.

- 3 -

problem, I should like to know who has made it and who are the personalities likely to clash. I do not like allegations being made without substantiation. In any event it is premature to make any suggestions with regard to clashes of personalities before the company has been merged and the posts filled.

I do think that all that discussion about the name was unfortunate. The fact is that Charlotte Mason had a rooted objection to the use of her name to describe the Movement she founded. She, herself, was most careful to describe the College as The House of Education and the Movement as the P.N.E.U. You will see in Miss Chelmondeley's own book, The Story of Charlotte Mason, page 53, in commenting adversely on Spencer, Pestalozzi and Froebel Movements, she quotes Miss Mason as saying that in all earnest educational effort, care must be taken to avoid limitations which would hinder the advance of science "especially that most serious of all hindrances, the docketing with any given name or names".

I was very surprised to hear it said that in Australia the name "Charlotte Mason" was better known than "P.N.E.U.", because if that were so, Australia must be unique. I have, however, gone very carefully into Australian records and if you would care to see the evidence I am quite sure you would be satisfied that there was little or no foundation for that statement. You might also care to see the attached copy of a letter I have had from Mrs. Franklin on the subject.

For what it is worth my own view is that there is a very great deal of good will attaching to the name "P.N.E.U."; and in point of policy Miss Mason was right not to saddle the Movement with a name which will tend to date it more and more as years go by. This does not mean that I do not realise how much Ambleside owes to her wisdom; but all of us who miss it, would do well to follow it.

Contd.

- 4 -

Paragraph 4 - I think there is reasonable identity of view among all those principally connected with the Charlotte Mason Movement and, therefore, the question of folly does not arise. The question of "holding strong cards" in co-ordinating an educational charity to make it more effective, introduces what to me is a slightly alien note, more in keeping with "take-over bids" in the world of commerce.

Paragraph 5 - I do not admit that the strength of an educational charity depends so much on the accident of possessions as on public esteem. I am afraid paragraph 5(a) strikes a note which I find wholly discordant with the kind of organisation with which we are dealing. Paragraph 5(b) seems reasonable to me; but wants a lot of mutual discussion. I should have liked to have found out before my formal meeting of the merger Sub-Committee, what you and Mrs. Walton had to suggest.

Paragraph 6 - The efforts here have considerably alleviated the financial difficulties of the P.N.E.U. which is now in a much better position financially than the Foundation, except for the Foundation's property. As a member of the Foundation, I am somewhat horrified at the financial position into which it has been allowed to drift; and the Fairfield decision does not bear thinking about. A subvention to the P.N.E.U. is, to my way of thinking, somewhat an opprobrious term. The position is that except for the Book Trade, which in fact supports the P.U.S. "Syllabus", the work at the P.N.E.U. Offices consists of very effective correspondence and publicity for the cause which, in turn results in schools, parents and members enrolling in the P.U.S. It is an obvious case of the proper disposal of the common income. The only effective way is, of course, to merge the two departments under one control; but apart from that a substantial portion of the cost of Vandon Street ought, in fairness to be borne by the Foundation.

Contd.

213p5pnau6o

- 5 -

In addition to your letter of August, 3rd., you were good enough to write to me on August, 8th. I have little comment on this letter apart from what I have said above, except that I find it difficult to meet a carefully drafted letter with numbered paragraphs by you if, when it comes to the point, you say you are a 'new boy' and therefore leave the answer to Mrs. Walton. Mrs. Walton and you then came to London and discussed the merger, but go away without seeing me. I do want you to know that I have spent a great deal of time and thought on this matter and have consulted with as many people as I can whose life interest or great concern is the Charlotte Mason Movement. May I also add that I know a great deal about you from friends and I have the utmost admiration for you in every way, and I would really appreciate your help in this matter and I feel that the cause would benefit from the mutual help we could give one another in deciding these points.

I am sending copies of this letter to Mrs. Franklin and Mrs. Walton.

Yours *Wm*  
*Basil.*

(Basil Marsden-Smedley)

214 pnew 160

As from: 34, Tedworth Square,  
London, S.W.3.

BMS/HB

12th. August, 1960.

Mrs. G.C. Walton,  
Galleons,  
Higher Lane,  
Mumbles,  
Swansea, Glam.

Dear Mrs. Walton,

I am sorry I have not replied to your letter in which you were good enough to let me have a number dates for the Merger Sub-Committee, which you found difficult, but I did hope that a meeting might have taken place with Jocelyn Norton, or yourself, at which we could have fixed a date mutually convenient.

I think that any day in the week beginning September 12th. would be convenient for me; but in order to be specific, I suggest Wednesday, September 14th.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Jocelyn Norton, as I would rather like to get the day fixed before I go to Ireland next Thursday. This would enable me to give ample warning to members of the Merger Sub-committee.

I also enclose a long letter I have written to Jocelyn Norton in answer to his letter to me. It would have been much easier to have dealt with these matters at an informal discussion.

Yours sincerely,

(Basil Mareden-Smedley)

15/11/60

COPY.

Eden Hay,  
Stanwix,  
Carlisle.

15th August 1960.

My dear Basil,

I can quite understand your feelings as expressed in your last letter, but I think the present position arises from two factors which I have endeavoured to bring out in my correspondence with you, and which I ought perhaps to re-emphasise.

The first is that it does seem to me from what I have heard and learnt of Charlotte Mason affairs since becoming a member of the C.M.F. Council that, whatever the degree of common attachment to the ideals of the movement, there is a certain divergence among those working for it, which I can only describe, as I did in my letter to you of the 3rd August as a clash either of aims (meaning, not ultimate ideals but views as to what types of activity in the movement are vital and what are not) or as to personalities. It is very difficult to conclude which, as policies and personalities become to some extent merged. I have absolutely no wish (and could have no possible motive for doing so) to magnify this aspect of things beyond what in fact exists, but the divergence must be recognised and catered for if the goodwill of everyone that is valuable to the movement is to be retained.

It is only in the light of this that some of the phrases in my original letter to which you have taken exception (and the "outlook" which they perhaps express) become understandable and, I hope, more acceptable. In other words, we are, in truth, endeavouring to merge two different bodies some of whose members hold strong views which they are not sure are shared by those in the other body, and these views must be reasonably assured of being respected if the merger is to be possible.

This brings me to the second point, which is the feeling that I know exists among some of those on the C.M.F. Council, and which I know Mrs. Walton herself has felt, that the merger is being rushed - not in the sense of lapse of time, because we know that it is many months since the topic was first raised, but in the sense of being presented with a "fait accompli", the very thing which you mentioned in your letter

(although we are now assured by Mr. Ranger that this is not the light in which he has been viewing the matter). It is perhaps better to express it that there has been, rightly or wrongly, a sense of being "steam-rollered".

With these two factors in mind you will perhaps understand the position in which Mrs. Walton and myself, as members of the sub-committee representing the C.M.F., have found ourselves. Mrs. Walton was anxious to have a discussion with Mr. Ranger on the whole position from the C.M.F. point of view (it has been agreed both sides should use the same lawyer for the negotiations, but this certainly did not imply that each side in the merger should not have separate access to him), and had already arranged an appointment with him. When I found that I had to be in London about the same time for another meeting I offered to accompany her, if she could manage to get the day altered, and I was very glad of the opportunity to meet him. Unfortunately, the only day and time that suited all three of us was just immediately prior to my having to go North again. We were anxious to have the talk with Mr. Ranger before going any further, and I also felt I could not usefully have a talk with myself prior to that meeting.

This brings me to still another matter - my role in the present discussions. I cannot possibly replace Mrs. Walton in the latter - not only is she Chairman with all that implies, but she has immeasurably much more knowledge about Charlotte Mason affairs, and all it stands for and the individuals concerned, than I can ever hope to have. It was only that as a member of the merger sub-committee and of the C.M.F. Council I was becoming a bit perturbed at the position that seemed to be looming ahead and I felt I ought to point out where it seemed to me things were going as to the general course of the negotiations. But ~~but~~ I did so fully conscious that I was not in a position to judge the rights and wrongs of the "issues" in question. That is why I feel that I must leave these matters to be thrashed out by others more competent to do so, having made my contribution (if indeed you will consider it one!) in trying to keep the general procedure regarding the merger on the right lines.

So far as the next merger sub-committee meeting is concerned September 14th would suit me well if the meeting could be in the morning of that day, as there is another meeting at 2.30. in the

21543 pms 160

- 3 -.

afternoon which I ought to try to attend if possible, and I will have to go back to the North that evening. I will only just have got back from holiday on Monday 12th so would find it difficult to get down to London any earlier than the late afternoon on the 13th.

I hope that you have a good holiday in Ireland.

Yours sincerely,

Jocelyn.

P.S. I have, of course, let Mrs. Walton have a copy of this letter.

B. Marsden Smiley, Esq.,  
34 Tedworth Square,  
Chelsea. S.W.3.

COPY.

46piaw (60)

Galleons,

Higher Lane,

Mumbles, Swansea.

15th August 1960.

Dear Mr. Marsden-Smedley,

This is to confirm our telephone conversation last night.

I have booked September 14th for a meeting at your house of the Merger Sub-committee. After speaking to you, Jocelyn Morton rang up and I find he would really prefer a morning meeting. I will therefore withdraw my plea for 2.30 p.m. and leave you completely free to arrange what suits the majority. I do hope that Mr. Petrie will be able to attend this time. Unfortunately, he is abroad on holiday at the moment, so we cannot get hold of him.

May I say again how delighted Courtnay and I would be if you could spare us a little time on your way back from Ireland. I think that it would be an excellent plan if you and I could have a talk before the sub-committee meeting. I am sure that the little difficulties and differences that have arisen can be smoothed out in a few frank discussions, and if you could give me rough dates, I could plan my domestic commitments so as to have as much free time as possible while you are with us. Given reasonable weather, you would, I know, find a host of subjects for your sketch book.

As I said to you last night I am sorry not to have seen you when I was in London, but in my then state of mental and physical "leaden-ness" I should have wasted your time and mine and so I followed my strong - if rather animal instincts to "go to ground" and caught the first possible train home and retired, with humility and thankfulness, to bed! I am now quite recovered and greatly enjoying the return of at least two of my wandering family.

Please give my greetings and love to Mrs. Franklin when you see her.

Yours sincerely,  
Geraldine Walton.